



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,039	08/23/2001	Karl W. Terry	7124.015	1958
30589	7590	07/08/2005	EXAMINER	
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS P.C. PO BOX 16370 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73113			ZIMMER, MARC S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/938,039	TERRY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marc S. Zimmer	1712

All Participants:

Status of Application: non-finally rejected

(1) Marc S. Zimmer.

(3) _____.

(2) Douglas Sorocco.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 May 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Terry et al., U.S. Patent # 6,342,097

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was advised that the Examiner had mistakenly failed to indicate that the present claims were unpatentable over those of U.S. patent # 6,342,097, which evolved from parent application serial no. 09/553,583. (The only differences being that the parent claims mention colloidal silica and the present claims provide a structural definition for the disilane.) However, the present composition claims are broader in the sense that they embrace other materials in view of their use of the transitional phrase comprising and so would include that embodiment in which colloidal silica was added. The patent claims do not disclose the structural attributes associated with the disilane that are outlined in the present claims. However, MPEP 804 states that those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970) These same structural attributes are described when disclosing the disilane in the Specification of 09/553,583. The Examiner requested that Applicant file a terminal disclaimer as a means of preventing the need for a double patenting rejection and thereby expediting prosecution...